DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 466 682 UD 035 081

AUTHOR	Slaughter-Defoe, Diana T.; Andrews, Adrianne; Zhang, Donghui
TITLE	African American Children and Successful Urban Public Elementary Schools.
PUB DATE	2002-03-20
NOTE	26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; *Black Students; Diversity (Student); Educational Policy; Elementary Education; High Risk Students; *Instructional Leadership; Low Income Groups; Parent Participation; Principals; *School Culture; Teacher Student Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*African Americans; Philadelphia School District PA

ABSTRACT

This study examines how the intersect of policy and practice, as articulated by educational leadership, created a school culture that fostered positive educational outcomes for at-risk, poor children in two Philadelphia public elementary schools. The school had reached and sustained an academic achievement standard that defied predicted levels for similar at-risk students. The study hypothesized that a philosophically coherent school community shared by pivotal stakeholders in the child's caregiving system would provide the necessary context for successful child outcomes. Between September 2000 and May 2001, researchers observed in classrooms and interviewed teachers and administrators. Results indicate that the schools had different missions and goals, and that they differed in how school community was structured and sustained by their principals and other in-school academic leaders and in related academic and social value orientations. The purposeful leadership of these two schools' principals contributed to the educational policies and practices that maximized the educational performance outcomes of at-risk students. Both schools provided extensive daily instruction in language arts mathematics, and reading. At both schools, teachers had extensive autonomy, and teacher-student interactions addressed feedback to students about academic performance, student discipline, and praise. Neither school displayed many instances of integrated approaches to racial identity development and cultural diversity within ongoing classroom instruction. (Contains 26 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 466 682

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.T. Slaughter-Defoe

3/20/02

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

African American Children and Successful Urban Public Elementary Schools

Diana T. Slaughter-Defoe, Adrianne Andrews, and Donghui Zhang[1]

Graduate School of Education

University of Pennsylvania

Introduction

The objective of this continuing ethnographic case study is to discover and describe how, and if, the intersect of policy and practice, as articulated by educational leadership, serve to create a school culture that fosters positive educational outcomes for at-risk, low-income children in two Philadelphia public elementary schools. The selected schools countered expectations by having reached and sustained an academic achievement standard that essentially defies predicted levels for similarly situated at-risk children. Thus, the schools are noted in this city for their consistent records of academic excellence and positive educational outcomes. Grades K-4 were selected for this study because primary grade levels have been shown to be the levels at which the first noticeable declines in achievement occur among at-risk students. The working assumption underlying this study, based on the findings of previous research with private schools (Slaughter-Defoe, 1995), was that schools that educate best demonstrate consistency between their mission and goals in terms of both policy and practice. Therefore, it was hypothesized that a philosophically coherent school community, shared by pivotal stakeholders in the child's caregiving system (e.g., administrators, teachers, parents), would provide the necessary and sufficient context for the successful child outcomes. Although this paper emphasizes the results of preliminary classroom observations, the larger case study also addresses parent-school relations.

UD 035 081

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Background

Edmonds (1979) introduced the concept of effective schools for lower income children. At that time, the concept did not include an emphasis on children's families, neighborhoods, and communities. In fact, the concept was designed to focus squarely on principal and teacher accountability for student achievement. A generation of child poverty, particularly among African Americans and other ethnic minority children and families in cities like Philadelphia (Wilson, 1996) has led to more deeply entrenched child and family poverty in urban metropolitan areas, with potentially predictable consequences for school achievement (Brooks-Gunn & Duncan, 1997). Philadelphia is typical of many such cities with disproportionate numbers of children living in poverty (Foley, 1998). Children are developing in a post-industrial society in which learning how to learn, life-long learning, problem-solving and problem-finding, and other critical thinking skills, will be even more highly valued in the future. Basic skills are essential if these same children are to be employable as adults. The kind of schooling experiences needed by the children differ from those of Edmonds' time, and therefore, the characteristics of effective schools could be expected to differ (Shields, 1991).

School Effectiveness Research: Early Foundations

School effectiveness research addressing public education is largely based on challenging the notion advanced in the 1960s (see Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfield, & York, 1966) that students' school achievement levels are strongly correlated to student background characteristics and not to school characteristics (Wang, Haertal, & Walberg, 1995). The implications of Coleman et al.'s research are most serious for lower income and minority students as responsibility for

low achievement is set squarely on their shoulders. Edmonds (1979) successfully demonstrated that there were schools in low-income and minority neighborhoods that managed to produce student achievement levels beyond the expectations for them based on their resources and high numbers of at-risk students and families served. Therefore, school effectiveness research had a foundation upon which to build.

From its earliest genesis, research on school effectiveness has been marked by differences in approach and perspective outlined in comprehensive reviews of the progress made toward deconstructing and working with Edmonds' model. The primary focus was on in-class and in-school educational accountability. Early deconstruction is perhaps best exemplified by a benchmark discussion of the basic issues in the field, inclusive of the role of parental involvement and participation in schools, by James Comer and Ronald Edmonds (National Center for Effective Schools, 1989).

School Effectiveness Research: Recent Developments

School effectiveness research has evolved over the last two decades and reviews of this research have concluded that fruitful and positive progress continues to be made (e.g., Wang et al., 1995; Fuller & Clarke, 1994; Kratzer, 1996). The definition of school effectiveness has shifted in its emphasis from one of equity to one of productivity (Binkowski, Cordeiro, & Iwanicki, 1995). Another basis of division in school effectiveness research stems from different approaches reviewers have discovered. For example, quantitative input-output studies, process-product studies, case studies, and outlier studies (Wang et al., 1995) have been suggested as four distinct ways that research in this area has been conducted.

A document issued by the Council of the Great City Schools (March, 1998) reported there is preliminary evidence of an "urban school comeback" based upon a growing consensus by urban educators on the importance of establishing high

expectations for all students, providing for corrective measures focusing on professional development and effective leadership, organization and management within schools, and strengthening relations between schools, community organizations, and the general public. Earlier, the Council (February, 1996) had reported that enhancing parental involvement in the education of children was third on the list of top educational priorities (following improved achievement and increased financial resources). Thus, a generation of research into the most effective schooling for "at-risk" youth, has shown that families and schools need to work together. Parental involvement and good family-school relations are essential in order to surpass conventional wisdom about the education of disadvantaged children and youth (Shields, 1991). The school community includes children's families, as well as school staff, teachers and peers. In this context, the public school principal has a responsibility not only to children, teachers and other school staff, but also to the children's parents and the neighboring community (Comer, 1980; Levin, 1991; Shields, 1991; Slaughter-Defoe, 1995).

Method

Fuller and Clarke (1994), working with data from the developing world, also note a division in the definition and research area positioning the "policy mechanics" approach, which emphasizes the identification of particular school inputs that raise student achievement against the "classroom culturalist" approach, which focuses on implicitly modeled norms used in classrooms and how children become socialized to accept these norms. The methods of this study are most closely aligned with the classroom culturalist approach. However, emphasis is on both school culture and classroom culture.

Focusing on educational research in the United States and examining the evolution of more advanced, multi-method tools for studying schooling, Stringfield & Herman (1996) noted the methodological progress made on the quantitative and qualitative fronts. Qualitatively, developments in alternative research methods, including the case study

methodology used in this study, have overcome the most persistently-cited limitations of quantitative analyses: insensitivity to school contextual or cultural environments. This research uses an ethnographic case study approach to study two of the educationally successful "outliers" serving children in Philadelphia. The study also uses triangulation in method since both statistical and textual data analyses are employed.

Both participating elementary schools (one is K-8, the other K-4) have a lower income African American student population of 40% or better (percentage of students eligible for free lunch; racial/ethnic breakdown), and are consistently high ranked in local reading and mathematics achievement scores, as identified in Philadelphia's Annual School Report Card. In addition, local public opinion of these schools is highly favorable.

Between September 2000 and May 2001, a total of 33 grade K-4 classroom observations were conducted at one of the schools, and 23 at the other, for a total of 56 five-hour sessions that were recorded and subsequently written up by the first (DTSD) and second (ARA) authors of this paper. Both qualitative researchers visited the same classes in both schools on different days. In addition, several interviews were conducted with both principals by the first author (DTSD).

Presently we are interviewing classroom teachers who have typically been at the schools for over 7 years (about 4-5 in each school) to further amplify existing historical case study information. Parent surveys are being conducted in the primary grades during the report card periods at each school. The data will be used to assist in interpreting already obtained classroom and school-based observations. The balance of this paper focuses on presentation of the preliminary results of classroom observations conducted in the primary grade classrooms of each school during 2000-2001.

Drs. Slaughter-Defoe and Andrews observed in the classrooms of both schools being contrasted in this paper. In addition, over the observational year, 2001-2002, the three co-authors met at least 25 times on a weekly basis in the process of monitoring the observational procedures, and obtaining preliminary agreements of what we were

observing in our respective schools and classrooms. The list of approximately 50 generated variables reflects what we saw and referenced in our discussions of our ongoing experiences in the schools. The list is not exhaustive, but it probably does comprise what would be most often and easily referenced if the focus of the observations emphasized were to emphasize teacher effectiveness during visits to these, or similarly situated, primary grade classrooms (Wang & Walberg, 1991).

Results

Each of the 56 classroom visits was summarized in detail by the field observers, the first and second authors of this paper, Slaughter-Defoe (DTSD) and Andrews (ARA), immediately following the observation period. The narrated records were then unitized according to the preferences of the individual field observer, typically when a time segment and/or a codable sequence of events had occurred. Using this procedure, a total of 1877 basic Nudist text units were generated by the two field observers, DTSD and ARA. These text units were subsequently (spring, summer 2001) coded by the two field observers (DTSD and ARA), and entered into NUDIST in fall, 2001 by the third co-author of this paper, Zhang (QSR NUDIST 4 User's Guide, 1997).

Field Observer Coding

Field observers routinely made reference to five different types of activity during the data collection and narrative writing phase of the observation portion of this project: 1) the nature of the classroom or field site upon entry (ENTRY); 2) related general and descriptive observations about the site throughout the particular observation session (GENERAL OBSERVATION); 3) all instances in which the field observer was drawn into classroom interaction as a "participant observer" by the teacher or by the children (MY INVOLVEMENT); 4) all instances in which a teacher queried the observer about the researcher's role (TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF RESEARCHER); and 5) instances of more reflective or interpretative, rather than descriptive, observer activity

(REFLECTION). Percentages of the total coded categories in these five areas were remarkably similar for both schools. For P. School they were 3% (Entry), 13.6% (General observation), 3.4% (My involvement), 2.8% (Teacher perceptions of researcher), and 9% (Reflection), respectively; for G. School they were 3.1% (Entry), 15.7% (General observation), 2.6% (My involvement), 3.2% (Teacher perceptions of researcher), and 9.8% (Reflection), respectively.

Analyses of results indicated the first author (DTSD) did more unitizing of the observations of classrooms in both schools than the second author (ARA).[2] DTSD had a total of 1360 text units (72% of total); ARA a total of 511 text units (28% of total). However, ARA conducted slightly more total school visits, particularly at P. School. DTSD completed 11 visits to P. School; ARA completed 22 visits; DTSD completed 14 visits to G. School; ARA completed 9 visits.[3] In summary, a total of 1008 text units were obtained for P. School, and a total of 869 units were obtained for G. School.

Coding Class Activity and Focus

Three clusters of coded categories or variables were created by the first author (DTSD): 1) Cluster A: Subject Matter; 2) Cluster B: Perceptible Classroom Climate and Organization; and 3) Cluster C: Interactions.

Cluster A refers to the explicit curriculum subject being studied during the observation that served to contextualize and designate the associated teacher and student activities and behaviors. School trips, infrequently made during observer days, were designated Extracurricular Activity,[4] and also clustered in this grouping. Cluster A coded categories were mutually exclusive. Students, for example, were not coded as studying Language Arts and Mathematics in the same coded unit. However, if more than one academic activity was being explicitly addressed by classroom students, the designation "Academic" was used.

Cluster B, Perceptible Classroom Climate and Organization, refers to the characteristic focus or purpose of the designated unit from the perspective of the overall

class climate and organization. One emphasis was on whether the class engaged in whole group instruction (DIRECT INSTRUCTION), independent projects (CHILD-CENTERED INSTRUCTION), or small group instruction (Direct instruction, and/or Child-centered instruction). Generally, a period of change in class behaviors (TRANSITION) ensued with a shift in classroom subject matter, affecting classroom climate and organization, even if only temporarily.

Other unusual experiences or contexts affected classroom climate and organization. On occasion, parents were present and even engaged in teaching students (PARENT PARTICIPATION). In-class examinations created a specific climate (EXAMINATION PROCEDURES), and usually demanded a particular type of organization and management, as did explicit emphases on cultural diversity (CULTURAL DIVERSITY LEARNING) and/or racial or ethnic identity (RACIAL IDENTITY LEARNING).

Unlike Cluster A coded categories, Cluster B coded categories were not designated mutually exclusive.

Finally, regardless of class activity or subject matter focus or the more general strategies observed to be in use to organize the classroom learning environments, teachers and students interacted verbally. Cluster C behaviors address this interactive focus. Some teacher behaviors focused on instructional efforts (ORIENTATION; CONTENT EXPANSION; FEEDBACK TO STUDENTS; SCAFFOLDING/ENABLING), while others seemed to address student motivational, social and behavioral characteristics. (NURTURING; SOCIAL SKILLS; STUDENT ENCOURAGEMENT; SCHOOL VALUES; PRAISE; DISCIPLINE-MILD VERBAL; DISCIPLINE-SANCTIONS; DISCIPLINE-ISOLATION). Also relative to teacher-student interactive focus, extremely high levels of student involvement or engagement with classroom activities (STUDENT ENGAGEMENT) as well as non-involvement or participation (STUDENT NON-PARTICIPATION) were recorded and coded. Teachers' interactive

strategies for managing students sometimes emphasized distinctions between boys and girls (GENDER DISTINCTIONS), a preference for one or another racial (PREFERENTIAL-RACIAL) or cultural (PREFERENTIAL-CULTURAL) group, or a preference for a particular gender (PREFERENTIAL-GENDER). Peer relations were recorded and coded on a preliminary basis for interactions particularly within and across gender and race (PEER RELATIONS A-D). Field observers also recorded instances of teacher interactions with other adults (TEACHER-ADULT RELATIONS), including the special instances of other teachers (CONVERSATION) and intrusions (CLASS INTERRUPTIONS).

Like Cluster B coded categories, Cluster C coded categories were also not designated mutually exclusive.

Cluster A. Subject Matter. Table 1 presents the percentages of observed text units in divergent primary grade subject-matter categories for both P. and G. Schools.

Insert Table 1 here

A total of 15 ranked coding categories that were identified and used in grades K-4 are included in Table 1. The rank-difference coefficient for this cluster of variables is $r = .335$, where $t = 1.282$, $df = 13$. This t is non-significant; it must reach 1.771 to be significant at the .05 level or better. Therefore, we have no reason to reject the null hypothesis indicating both schools, when observed, gave approximately equivalent time and effort to traditional school subjects. Reading, Mathematics, and Language Arts rank highest. However, we observed few instances of Science activity at P. School, and almost no instances of Music activity at G. School.

Cluster B: Classroom Climate and Organization. Table 2 presents the percentages of observed text units focused on classroom climate and organization of

the learning environment This table has the following eight ranked categories:

Insert Table 2 here

Child-centered instruction, Direct instruction, Class rituals and routines, Examination procedures, Cultural diversity learning, Racial identity learning, Parent participation and Transition. The rank-difference coefficient for this cluster of variables is $r = .839$, where $t = 3.778$, $df = 6$. This t is significant at the $p < .01$ level. The variable in this cluster that most clearly distinguishes the two schools is Parent Participation. G. School had more recorded instances of parental participation in classroom instructional activities than P. School. Many of those observed instances were quite rich and involved. Both schools were observed to use both Child-centered and Direct instructional strategies throughout the primary grades, and frequently in the same classrooms, though P. School appeared to favor the child-centered instructional approach. Neither school integrated cultural and racial issues into classroom content to any great degree; though other more general school observations indicated P. School focused attention to this area at the end of each school year in specially prepared projects.

Cluster C: Teacher and Student Interactions. Table 3 presents the percentages of observed text units focused on teacher and student interactions in the learning environments observed. The rank-difference coefficient for this cluster of

---

Insert Table 3 here

---

variables is $r = .819$. The t is 6.987, $df = 24$, significant at $p < .005$. The eight variables in this cluster that most clearly distinguish the two schools in order of magnitude are: (1) Discipline C-Isolation or Time Out; (2) Content expansion; (3) Peer relations A: same race and gender; (4) Preferential-Racial; (5.5) Scaffolding/enabling; (5.5) Nurturing; (7) Gender distinctions; and (8) Social skills. G. School has a noticeably higher rank on Content expansion, incidence of same race/same gender Peer relations, incidence of racial Preference shown by teachers, and Scaffolding/enabling. G. School also has higher ranking on 3 of the 4 (excluding Orientation) instructional categories (i.e., Feedback to students, Scaffolding/enabling in addition to Content expansion). Finally, G. School has a higher incidence of Gender distinctions, such that children are grouped and managed by direct reference to their gender. In contrast, P. School has noticeably higher rankings on incidence of Disciplinary Isolation (separation from group, time-out, etc.), and of incidence of observed teacher Nurturing and focus on the children's Social skills.

Discussion

The aim of the discussion is to interpret the field observational findings with respect to the classes and activities of these two elementary schools attended by African American children who are experiencing school success. Observations will be interpreted in view of what we saw and learned, and of what we know about the schools, in particular the history of African American families with these schools, and the role of school leadership, relative to parent participation, attention to basics, and teacher autonomy. Further, what we have been finding is discussed in view of earlier research with successful private schools (Slaughter-Defoe, 1995).

The findings presented in Table 1 should be construed as pertaining to what field observers saw and learned about when classroom observations were made, typically in the mornings, ending after lunch around 1:30pm. For example, the apparently limited focus on Science activities at P. School could be accounted for by

the fact that visits were generally limited to the same day each week (and the same day bi-weekly at G. School) for one observer (ARA). Science activities generally took place outside of the observation days and times. Because Science activities occurred on alternating days and late in the day, they were either observed on days when visits were rescheduled or on days when ARA stayed until the very end of the school day.

What we do know from reviewing class schedules, however, is that at both schools in the mornings children in grades K-4 were given extensive daily instruction in language arts, mathematics, and reading. Frequently, during periods of child-centered instruction, children's experiences in more than one of these areas were combined (Academic). Music lessons were frequently observed at P. School; Science lessons, and lessons in Foreign language learning at G. School. Neither Spelling nor Social Studies were ranked above the top 5 in either school.

Looking at Table 2, the reader might conclude that with regard to classroom climate and organization of learning environments, the two schools are very similar with the exception of G. School having been observed to have more parent participation in classroom instructional activities. Nothing could be further from the truth. G. School is larger that P. School, and has a history of formalism and serious, stately approach to the processes of education and learning, that counters the convivial, humanistic, open approach of P.'s school culture. Only a small number of P. School parents can be regularly active in its school activities, since the livelihoods of many do not afford flexible hours and schedules for parent participation during the day. Nor are there, as is the case with G. School parents, a number of "stay-at-home" parents with children in the school. Nonetheless, it is important that, given the extensive amount of teacher autonomy extended to faculty at both schools, G. School teachers avail themselves of this parent community as a significant resource and source of support to their ongoing instructional activities. Rich and deep instances of parental participation were observed at G. School, and parents are a significant part of the school's fabric, thanks to the leadership

provided by that school's principal in this area.

P School integrates cultural diversity issues into its curriculum, particularly at a school-wide level toward the conclusion of each school year, during which projects that began earlier in the year at the individual child level culminate in a school-wide celebration. We came to believe that P School has been successful in educating students because a school culture has been developed in which teachers are permitted autonomy in determining their teaching styles. The values conveyed verbally to the children, and integrated into the curriculum, are enacted in the autonomy granted the teachers in how they choose to teach, and how they incorporate best practice into their teaching.. The climate of the school is such that teachers and students alike are empowered. The values verbally conveyed to the students throughout the school are enacted and modeled through the freedom of creative teaching (Slaughter-Defoe & Andrews, 2001).

However, despite teacher autonomy and what we know of the racial histories of both schools, we observed few instances of integrated approaches to racial identity development and cultural diversity within the ongoing classroom instructional activities. For example, P. School has had a long-standing commitment to racial integration (Slaughter-Defoe & Andrews, 2001), and G. School, though it is a neighborhood school, has a reputation for having only recently (past 10 years) encouraged the attendance of African American students.

Data in Table 3 indicate that interactions between teachers and students at both schools address feedback to students about their academic performances, and student discipline and praise. The faculty at P. School are somewhat more likely to be nurturing, to emphasize school values, and the development of students' social skills. These observational findings are consistent with the more "humanistic" value orientation (Slaughter & Schneider, 1986; Slaughter & Johnson, 1988) of P. School.

In somewhat of a contrast, faculty at G. School stress more varied and elaborate styles of direct instruction. In earlier research, the first author has labeled

this classroom orientation "deliberate" noting that African American parents, unlike other parents, were particularly approving of its more "teacher-centered" focus (Slaughter & Schneider, 1986; Slaughter & Johnson, 1988).

Consistent with its formalism and status-orientation, some faculty at G. School were observed to make more gender distinctions ("Boys should line up here, girls there," etc. sorts of statements), and to exhibit more preferential behavior by race of child. However, at both schools observed instances of such treatments of students were ranked very low. This suggests that principal leadership in both schools has a strong and forceful role in encouraging equity in educational processes.

In the immediate future, discussions around these issues will occur with both principals. The newer principal at G. School expressed a desire for the school to move forward in this direction when interviewed. Further, at P. School, for example, there is a high value placed on respect for diversity throughout the school; diversity in teaching learning styles, in the composition of the student body, faculty, and staff. As one teacher said in conversation, "Everything in education comes hard. Supplies, everything. But we're lucky because we have a good principal...You have to have a good principal. Ours is good. She looks out for us." Thus, the school culture that has developed with the leadership of a progressive principal allows for and accommodates diversity. Mutual respect and cooperation are both directly and indirectly taught, through instruction and by the modeling of appropriate behaviors.

Educational Implications

This paper reports data from an ongoing study of the classroom learning environments in grades K-4 of two contrasting Philadelphia schools that are successfully serving 40 percent or more lower income and African American children. However, what has been observed in the classroom pedagogy is being interpreted in the

context of each school's mission and goals, as shared by administrators, teachers, and parents.

Both schools are multicultural and multiracial. However, the mission and goals of these two public neighborhood elementary schools, inclusive of philosophical underpinnings affecting the children's educability are different. They differ in how school community is structured and sustained by their principals and other in-school academic leaders, and in related academic and social value orientations. We were able to interpret what we observed in classrooms in view of our understanding of the cultural context of both of these very different, but top-performing, schools. Therefore, it is absolutely essential to look past achievement performance criteria to avoid concluding that "one size fits all" and that there is one path toward successful education of children, including African American children. Clearly, that viewpoint ignores the contributions of school culture, history, and leadership to the educational process. In concluding this study, our other interview and survey data will be integrated to make this point even more forcefully. The purposeful leadership of these two schools' women principals has contributed to educational practices and policies that maximize the educational performance outcomes of the at-risk children attending the schools they administer.

The purposes of this paper have been to introduce the study and to share some of the obtained classroom observational data. Since a holistic ethnographic approach is used to study the schools, the results could contribute significantly to the field of education by helping to establish contemporary criteria for excellence in urban elementary education. By focusing on the lived experiences of young children in successful public schools, and thus describing the effects of the school and its neighboring community upon the achievements of the students, this study contributes to the national focus on similar schools serving young children, and to an understanding of the factors conducive to children's successful transition into middle school and

beyond. Finally, the intensive study of urban schools that successfully educate primary grade students and their constituents contributes to a more general understanding of the potential of public schooling in the 21st century by describing how the in-school lives of elementary school-aged children are impacted by partnerships between families and schools that appear to service the children effectively.

References

Binkowski, K., Cordeiro, P., & Iwanicki, E. (1995, April). A qualitative study of higher and lower performing elementary schools. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Brooks-Gunn, J. & Duncan, G. (1997). The effects of poverty on children. The Future of Children: Children and Poverty, 7 (2), 40-54.

Casserly, M., & Root, M. (1996, February). Critical trends in urban education: A poll of America's great city schools. Washington, DC: Council of the Great City Schools.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfield, F., & York, R. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, DC.: US. Government Printing Office.

Comer, J. (1980). School power: Implications of an intervention project. New York: Free Press.

Council of the Great City Schools (1996-97). Annual Report. Washington, DC: Author.

Council of the Great City Schools. (1998, March). Signs of progress: Preliminary evidence of urban school comeback. Urban Indicator, 4 (2). Washington, DC: Author.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37 (1), 15-27.

Edwards, A. (1969). Statistical analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Foley, E. (1998, March). Restructuring student support services: Redefining the role of the school district. Unpublished paper available from Consortium for Policy

Research in Education (CPRE), Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3440 Market St., Philadelphia, PA.

Fuller, B., & Clarke, P. (1994). Raising school effects while ignoring culture?: Local conditions and the influence of classroom tools, rules, and pedagogy. Review of Educational Research, 64 (1), 119-57.

Hope for Urban Education: A Study of Nine High-Performing, High-Poverty, Urban Elementary Schools (1999, December). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Department of Planning and Evaluation. (Available from: http://www.ed.gov/pub/urbanhope) Jackson, P. (1968). Life in the classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Jones, L., & Newman, L. (1997). Our America: Life and death on the south side of Chicago. New York, NY: Scribner.

Kratzer, C. (1996, April). Beyond "effective schools research": Cultivating a caring community in an urban school. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.

Levin, H. (1991). Educational acceleration for at-risk students. In A. Huston (Ed.), Children in poverty: Child development and public policy (pp. 222-240). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development (1989). A conversation between James Comer and Ronald Edmonds: Fundamentals of effective school improvement. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt Publishing Co. [2460 Kerper Blvd. P.O. Box 539, 52004-0539].

QSR NUDIST 4 User's Guide (1997, June). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Pub., Inc.

Shields, P. (1991). School and community influences on effective academic instruction. In M. Knapp & P. Shields (Eds.), Better schooling for the children of poverty: Alternatives to conventional wisdom (pp. 313-328). Berkeley, CA:

McCutchan.

Slaughter-Defoe, D. (1995). Revisiting the concept of socialization: Caregiving and teaching in the 90s--A personal perspective. American Psychologist, 50 (4), 276-286.

Slaughter-Defoe, D., & Andrews, A. (2001). Nurturing success: An ethnographic study of a high achieving Philadelphia public elementary school. Unpublished paper presented at the 22nd annual Ethnography Forum, Center for Urban Ethnography, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, March 2-3, 2001

Slaughter, D., & Johnson, D. (Eds.), (1988). Visible Now: Blacks in private schools. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Slaughter, D., & Schneider, B. (1986). Newcomers: Blacks in private schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Nos. ED 274 768 and ED 274 769).

Stringfield, S., & Herman, R. (1996). Assessment of state of school effectiveness research in the United States of America. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 7 (2), 159-180.

Wang, M., Haertel, G., & Walberg, H. (1995). Research on school effects in urban schools. Philadelphia, PA: The National Center on Education in the Inner Cities, No. 95-12.

Wang, M., & Walberg, H. (1991). Teaching and educational effectiveness: Research synthesis and consensus from the field. In M. Wang and H. Walberg (Eds.), Effective teaching: Current research (pp. 81-104). Berkeley, CA; McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Wilson, W. (1996). When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor. New York, NY: Alfred Knopf.

Zhang, D. (2001). Bilingual programs: The way out for Chinese immigrant children. Unpublished paper presented at the 2001 Spencer Foundation Student

Research Forum, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, March 23, 2001

Footnotes

[1]Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002, in the session, Gender and Race: Issues Related to K-12 Settings (Committee on Scholars and Advocates for Gender Equity, Committee on Scholars of Color in Education) Copies are available from Diana Slaughter-Defoe, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19104-6216. Background reading for this particular public school research project was begun with the first author's first postdoctoral fellow, Dr. Wendy Akua Addae in 1998-99, given her original intent to adapt techniques developed in an earlier study of four successful Chicago-area private schools to the present formulation of the identical research question in the public school arena (Slaughter & Schneider, 1986; Slaughter & Johnson, 1988). Permission to conduct research in the Philadelphia public schools was granted in spring 2000.

[2]By professional background, Dr. Slaughter-Defoe is a developmental and clinical psychologist. At the time of data collection and coding, Dr. Andrews, whose doctorate is in anthropology, was a postdoctoral fellow in urban education at the University of Pennsylvania. The criteria for unitizing were left to each observer. It is believed that in unitizing the classroom narratives, DTSD was more likely to emphasize sequence-of-events, while ARA was more likely to emphasize time.

[3]Site visits were limited to October through March. Access was limited during school start-up in September, and in April when annual testing occurred. Classroom observations were completed by May, 2001.

[4]Given her schedule, ARA observed on a number of school trips both at P, school and at G. school. The trips were felt to be data rich experiences especially relative to the enactment of school values, curricular expansion and elaboration, parent-teacher interaction, student-teacher interaction, and peer relations.

Table 1
Percentages of Observed Text Units in Divergent Primary Grade Subject-Matter Categories

Subject Matter	P. Public School			G. Public School		
	%	Rank	(N^a)	%	Rank	(N^a)
Language arts	18.8	1	(189)	7.8	4	(68)
Math	11	2	(115)	11	1	(96)
Reading	10	3	(102)	10	2	(88)
Academic	9.6	4	(97)	8.7	3	(77)
Recess	5.6	5	(56)	1.5	14	(13)
Music	4.7	6	(48)	0.2	15	(2)
Spelling	3.5	7	(35)	2.6	10	(23)
Lunch	2.8	8	(28)	1.7	13	(15)
Social Studies	2.2	9	(22)	5.5	5	(48)
Extracurricular Activity	2	10	(21)	2.4	11	(21)
Library	1.6	11	(16)	1.8	12	(16)
Gym	1	12	(11)	2.6	7	(23)
Science	0.9	13	(10)	3.3	6	(29)
Foreign language teaching	0.5	14	(5)	2.8	8.5	(24)
Arts and crafts	0	15	(1)	2.8	8.5	(24)

Note: The total number of units observed at P. School was 1008; at G. School it was 869. Since they continued in one of the above earlier classified categories, not all units were coded according to ongoing subject matter. We believe the 252 units at P. School and the 302 units at G. School that were unclassified by subject matter would probably not have significantly changed subject matter rankings if they had been classified. Table 1 codes are mutually exclusive to each other in a given unit.

N^a = Raw number of NUDIST text units.

The rank-difference coefficient for this cluster of variables is $r = .335$, where $t = 1.282$, $df = 13$. This t is not significant.

Table 2
Percentages of Observed Text Units Focused on Classroom Climate and Organization of the Learning Environment

	P. Public School			G. Public School		
	%	Rank	(N[a])	%	Rank	(N[a])
Child-centered instruction	32.6	1	(329)	19.1	1.5	(166)
Direct instruction	8.5	3	(86)	19.1	1.5	(166)
Class rituals and routines	2.5	5	(25)	5.5	5	(48)
Examination procedures	1	8	(10)	2.8	7	(24)
Cultural diversity learning	4.7	4	(47)	4.6	6	(40)
Racial identity learning	1.2	7	(12)	2.4	8	(21)
Parent participation	1.6	6	(16)	6.4	4	(56)
Transition	18.4	2	(185)	15.5	3	(135)

Note: The total number of units observed at P. School was 1008; at G. School it was 869. Codes in Table 2 are not mutually exclusive to any given unit.

N[a] = Raw number of NUDIST text units.

The rank-difference coefficient for this cluster of variables is $r = .839$, where $t = 3.778$, $df = 6$. This t is significant at the $p < .01$ level.

Table 3

Percentages of Observed Text Units Focused on Teacher and Student Interactions in the Learning Environment

Interaction Focus			P. Public School			G. Public School		
			%	Rank	(N[a])	%	Rank	(N[a])
Teacher-Student								
	Instruction-centered	Orientation	9.5	1	(96)	7	5	(61)
		Content expansion	0.8	23	(8)	2.2	14	(19)
		Feedback to students	6.8	4	(69)	11.3	1	(98)
		Scaffolding/enabling	2.7	16.5	(27)	2.5	11	(22)
	Social-behavioral centered	Nurturing	2.9	15	(29)	1	21	(7)
		Social skills	3.9	12	(39)	2	16	(17)
		Student encouragement	3.4	13.5	(34)	4	8	(35)
		School values	4.5	8.5	(45)	2.4	12.5	(21)
		Praise	4.4	10.5	(44)	5.6	7	(49)
		Student engagement	5.4	6	(54)	8.1	3	(70)
		Student non-participation	4.5	8.5	(49)	3.6	9	(31)
		Discipline-Mild Verbal	8.6	3	(87)	8.2	2	(71)
		Discipline-Sanctions	9.2	2	(93)	7.9	4	(69)
		Discipline-Isolation	5	7	(50)	1.8	17	(16)
		Gender distinctions	1.6	20	(16)	2.1	15	(18)
		Preferential-racial	0.1	25	(1)	1.6	18	(14)
		Preferential-culture	0.	26	(0)	0.6	24.3	(5)
		Preferential-gender	0.2	24	(2)	0.6	24.3	(5)

Table 3, continued

Student - Student								
		Peer relations-general	2	18	(20)	1.5	19	(13)
		Peer relations A[b]	2.7	16.5	(27)	0.6	24.3	(5)
		Peer relations B[c]	1.5	21	(15)	0.9	22	(8)
		Peer relations C[d]	1.8	19	(18)	1.3	20	(11)
		Peer relations D[e]	1.2	22	(12)	0.7	23	(6)
Teacher - Other Adult(s)								
		Class interruptions	6.5	5	(66)	5.8	6	(50)
		Conversation	3.4	13.5	(35)	2.9	10	(25)
		Teacher-adult relations	4.4	10.5	(44)	2.4	12.5	(21)

Note: The total number of units observed at P. School was 1008; at G. School it was 869. Codes in Table 3 are not mutually exclusive to a given unit.

N[a] = Raw number of NUDIST text units

A[b] = Interactions between same race and same gender peers

B[c] = Interactions between same race and cross gender peers

C[d] = Interactions between cross race and same gender peers

D[e] = Interactions between cross race and gender peers

The rank-difference coefficient for this cluster of variables is $r = .819$. The t is 6.987, $df = 24$, This t is significant at $p < .005$.

UD035081

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: African American Children and Successful Urban Public Elementary Schools

Author(s): Diana T. Slaughter-Defoe, Adrianne Andrews, Donghui Zhang

Corporate Source: University of Pennsylvania

Publication Date: April 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

Please fax a copy of this. Thanks.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Diana T. Slaughter-Defoe	Printed Name/Position/Title: Diana T. Slaughter-Defoe
Organization/Address: Grad. Sch. of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Phila., PA 19104	Telephone: (215) 573-3947 FAX: (215) 563-4324
	E-Mail Address: dianasd@gse.upenn.edu Date: 4/3/02

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org